

KERSHAW, CUTTER & RATINOFF, LLP  
William A. Kershaw (State Bar No. 057486)  
Email: [wkershaw@kcrlegal.com](mailto:wkershaw@kcrlegal.com)  
C. Brooks Cutter (State Bar No. 121407)  
Email: [bcutter@kcrlegal.com](mailto:bcutter@kcrlegal.com)  
Stuart C. Talley (State Bar No. 180374)  
Email: [stalley@kcrlegal.com](mailto:stalley@kcrlegal.com)  
John R. Parker, Jr. (State Bar No. 257761)  
Email: [jparker@kcrlegal.com](mailto:jparker@kcrlegal.com)  
401 Watt Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95864  
Telephone: (916) 448-9800  
Facsimile: (916) 669-4499

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
Michael James Goodglick, Karen Young,  
Joshua Gilson, Brandon Ellison Reininger,  
Trevor Antunez, Jessica Lares, Jaywill Sands,  
Bryan Colver, Jaclyn Badolato, Nicole  
Stankovitz, and Vinny Curbelo

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MICHAEL JAMES GOODGLICK,  
KAREN YOUNG, JOSHUA GILSON,  
BRANDON ELLISON REININGER,  
TREVOR ANTUNEZ, JESSICA LARES,  
JAYWILL SANDS, BRYAN COLVER,  
JACLYN BADOLATO, NICOLE  
STANKOVITZ, and VINNY CURBELO,  
on behalf of themselves and all others who  
are similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,  
vs.

APPLE INC., AT&T CORP.,

Defendants.

Case No. 10-cv-02862 RMW

**CLASS ACTION**

**ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
CONSIDER WHETHER CASES  
SHOULD BE RELATED (Civil Local  
Rule 3-12)**

Case Assigned to Judge Ronald M. Whyte

Related Cases:

*Benvenisty v. Apple, Inc.*  
Case No. 10-cv-02885

*Dydyk v. Apple, Inc.*  
Case No. 10-cv-02897

*Rodgers v. Apple, Inc.*  
Case No. 10-cv-02916

*Popik v. Apple, Inc., et al.*  
Case No. 10-cv-02928

*Tietze v. Apple, Inc.*  
Case No. 10-cv-02929

*Pasano v. Apple, Inc., et al.*  
Case No. 10-cv-03919

*Mayo v. Apple, Inc.*  
Case No. 10-cv-03017

*Aguilera v. Apple, Inc., et al.*  
Case No. 10-cv-03056

**TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that eight different cases related to this, the first-filed action, namely,

*Benvenisty v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02885

*Dydyk v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02897

*Rodgers v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02916

*Popik v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-02928

*Tietze v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02929

*Pasanao v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-03919

*Mayo v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-03017

*Aguilera v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-03056

have been filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 3-12(b) of the United States District Court of the Northern District of California, Plaintiffs Michael James Goodglick, Karen Young, Joshua Gilson, Brandon Ellison Reininger, Trevor Antunez, Jessica Lares, Jaywill Sands, Bryan Colver, Jaclyn Badolato, Nicole Stankovitz, and Vinny Curbelo, (collectively, "Plaintiffs") in this action submit this administrative motion to consider whether the above-named cases filed in the Northern District of California should be related to the present case, the low number action pending in this District in front of the Honorable Judge Ronald M. Whyte.

1        These actions filed in the Northern District of California all involve substantially the  
2 same transactions, events, questions of law, and allege essentially the same violations of  
3 California law. Each of these cases allege defendant Apple, Inc., produced, marketed, and sold a  
4 defective product, namely the iPhone 4, without disclosing its inherent antenna-related design  
5 and manufacturing defect to consumers. Each of these cases alleges that a national class of  
6 consumers were harmed by as result of the defective iPhone 4 sold and promoted by defendant  
7 Apple, Inc. These actions assert claims on behalf of a national class against defendant Apple,  
8 Inc., claiming that it has violated California common law, the California Unfair Competition  
9 Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200), and the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act (Cal  
10 Bus. & Prof. Code § 1750).

11        Given the common questions of fact and law presented by these cases, it appears likely  
12 there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense and potentially conflicting  
13 results if the cases are heard before different judges.

14        Given the similarities of these actions, assignment of these cases to a single Federal  
15 District Court Judge will conserve judicial resources and promote efficient determination of the  
16 actions while avoiding potentially conflicting results. These matters are at a preliminary state  
17 and, thus, assignment to a single judge would not prejudice any of the parties. Accordingly,  
18 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the actions entitled:

19        *Benvenisty v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02885

20        *Dydyk v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02897

21        *Rodgers v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02916

22        *Popik v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-02928

23        *Tietze v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-02929

24        *Pasanao v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-03919

25        *Mayo v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-03017

26        *Aguilera v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-03056

1 be deemed related to *Goodglick, et al. v. Apple Inc., et al.*, the first-filed case in this District that  
2 is assigned to the Honorable Judge Ronald M. Whyte.

3  
4 Dated: July 14, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

5 KERSHAW, CUTTER, & RATINOFF, LLP

6  
7 By: /s/ Stuart C. Talley

8 Stuart C. Talley

9 William A. Kershaw

C. Brooks Cutter

10 John R. Parker, Jr.

401 Watt Avenue

11 Sacramento, California 95864

Telephone: (916) 448-9800

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27